

App. No. 09/981,287 -  
Attorney Docket 3234.2.1 NP

**Amendments to the Drawings**

None

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**JUL 17 2006**

App. No. 09/981,287  
Attorney Docket 3234.2.1 NP

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUL 17 2006

**Remarks**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Written Office Action and for the Continued Examination.

With regard to the substantive portion of the Written Office Action, Claim 59 was objected to as including an informality and Claims 1 – 12 and 42 – 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Domae et al. (US 6,088,004).

In response to the Written Office Action, Claims 5, 6, and 8 – 10 are canceled; Claims 1 and 59 are amended; and Claims 67 – 71 are new.

In particular, Claim 59 was amended to address the informality.

Further, Claims 1 and 59 were amended to positively claim the computer-readable medium including the instructions described in the Claims and not disclosed in the cited references. In particular, the Applicant notes that while the structure of Domae et al. might possibly be able to carry out the instructions of the Claims if so instructed, there is never any mention of any computer-readable medium including such instructions.

As an example, Applicant respectfully points out that Domae et al. never makes any reference to displaying random images or displaying images for random intervals. Instead, Domae et al. only discloses actively choosing a particular image to display.

Wherein the amended claims include limitations not disclosed in the cited reference, rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is improper. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of Claims 1 – 12 and 42 – 66 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and respectfully requests prompt allowance of the Claims.

More, the Applicant believes that Claims 67 – 71 include subject matter disclosed in the original specification. Also, Claims 67 – 71 positively recite the computer-


App. No. 09/981,287  
Attorney Docket 3234.2.1 NP

readable medium including instructions which are not disclosed in the cited references.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 67 – 71.

For these reasons, it is believed that none of the prior art teaches the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is believed that the foregoing amendment has adequate support in the specification, and accordingly there should be no new matter. Applicant believes the pending claims have addressed each of the issues pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action. In light of the foregoing amendment, the claims should be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the proposed changes, Applicant again invites the Examiner to do so by telephone conference.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Michael W. Starkweather  
Registration No. 34,441  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 6/20/06

Starkweather and Associates  
9035 South 1300 East  
Suite 200  
Sandy, Utah 84094  
Telephone: 801/272-8368